

I arrived in town about sunset, where I have been ever since, till yesterday. Scenes were enacted yesterday, in Leavenworth City, that would not lose any thing if placed in comparison with

POETRY.

AMY MATILDA.

BY R. DOUGLASS.

Thou wert the loveliest of thy sex, dear friend;
Around thee play'd all feelings that were kind,
That seemed of heaven—which joyfully did lend
A never-forgotten, charming grace of mind.

Thy presence was a joy to all,
Thy sunny smile dissolved indifference dead,
Thy cheerful voice so pleasantly would fall,
That started discord hurriedly had fled.

For those, who 'neath Oppression's lash do smart,
Thou'lt sadly weep, because thou couldst not save;
The surest road, Matilda, to thy heart,
Was pleading for the wronged, unhappy slave.

Oh! I have seen thee, in the days gone by,
When Happiness was seated on thy brow,
Dispensing ever smiles, nether a sigh,
Surrounded by thy loved ones—'tis it now

The same! Alas! it is not—cannot be again;
Those loving hearts by distance are dispersed;
Where Happiness once dwelt, Death now doth reign—
Time hath the affections gloomily enshaded.

Thou wert the young friend of my mother dear,
Who long since left us for the spirit home;
And though I cannot check the rising tear,
'Tis joy to think where she is, thou hast flown.

Within a peaceful haven now thou art,
Where life's too frequent tempests cannot come—
Farewell, Matilda! loving, kindly heart,
Untroubled rest—thy pilgrimage is done.

Philadelphia, Sept. 14, 1856.

From the New York Evening Post.

LAMENT OF KANSAS.

Clouds gather drearily;

Dark is my sky;

And I sit wearily,

Wearily sigh.

Ah! this great sorrow!

Cometh no more!

Is no succor nigh?

Fair spreads the woodland;

Rivers and plain

Mark nobly my good land;

God's gifts are vain!

For this is the hour

Of Slavery's power;

Fell is her chain.

Worse than the savage

The robber-hordes be;

Ruthless who ravage

The homes of the free;

Treading all right to earth—

Crushing the fairest birth

Of Liberty.

Minions of Slavery—

Vile brotherhood—

Wrought the foul knavery;

Dyed it in blood.

Scorned shall their name be;

Burning their shame be;

Traitors to good!

Your homes are sparkling,

Fair sisters in light,

While I sit darkling,

Buried in night.

By the freedom you cherish,

Oh! let me not perish—

Rise in your might!

B.

FREMONT AND VICTORY.

THE PRIZE SONG.

BY CHARLES S. WEYMAN.

Ain—'Suoni la Tromba'—PURITANI.

I.

Men of the North, who remember

The deeds of your sires, ever glorious,

Join in our paeon victories!

The paeon of Liberty!

F'a k! on the gales of November

Millions of voices are ringing,

Glorious the song they are singing—

Fremont and Victory!

Hurrah!

Join the great chorus they're singing,

Fremont and Victory!

II.

Come from your forest-clad mountains,

Come from the fields of your tillage,

Come forth from city and village,

Join the great host of the free!

As from their cavernous fountains

Roll the deep floods to the ocean,

Join the great army in motion,

Marching to victory!

Hurrah!

Echo, from ocean to ocean,

Fremont and Victory!

III.

Far in the West rolls the thunder,

The tumult of battle is raging,

Where bleeding Kansas is waging

Warfare with Slavery!

Struggling with foes who surround her,

Lo! she implores you to stay her!

Will you to Slavery betray her?

Never—she shall be free!

Hurrah!

Swear that you'll never betray her;

Kansas shall yet be free!

IV.

March! we have sworn to support her;

The prayers of the righteous shall speed us;

A chief never conquered shall lead us—

Fremont shall lead the free!

Then from those fields, red with slaughter

Freedom's hordes shall be driven,

Freedom to Kansas be given,

Fremont shall make her free!

Hurrah!

To Kansas shall freedom be given;

Fremont shall make her free!

V.

Men of the North, who remember

The deeds of your sires, ever glorious,

Join in our paeon victories!

The paeon of Liberty!

Hark! on the gales of November

Millions of voices are ringing,

Glorious the song they are singing—

Fremont and Victory!

Hurrah!

Join the great chorus they're singing,

Fremont and Victory!

A NUT FOR THE LEARNED TO CRACK.

Ignoramus.

Whether was first, the egg or the hen?

Tell me, I pray you, ye learned men.

First Scribble.

The hen was first, or whence the egg?

Give us no more of your doubts, I beg.

Second Scribble.

The egg was first, or whence the hen?

Tell me how it could come, and when.

Ignoramus.

A fig for your learning! 'tis I judge, I vow!

If o' a't settle this question, now;

So o' a I pray you, ye learned men.

Whence was first, the egg or the hen?

THE LIBERATOR.

IS IT RIGHT TO CAST A VOTE?

OSKOSH, Wis., Sept. 11, 1856.

W. L. GARRISON.

MY DEAR SIR:—I have noticed recently several articles in THE LIBERATOR, setting forth and enforcing the non-voting theory held by yourself and your particular confidants: these articles I presume are intended especially to influence the course of abolitionists in the presidential election. I am one claiming to be an abolitionist, without an if or a but; and yet holding to the right and duty of political action. Will you allow me the privilege of explaining to your readers how I justify such action to the public, and to my own conscience? I would do this with modesty, claiming for my views and opinions no special originality; yet knowing, that through the mouths of many witnesses, the truth shall be brought to light, and by much discussion the path of duty shall be made clear.

First, then, respecting the character of the Constitution, whether pro-slavery or anti-slavery. Here, you, singularly enough, are in perfect agreement with the whole pro-slavery sentiment, North and South; you seem to be struck with a singular regard for law and precedent when discussing this point. You ask triumphantly, 'Have not the decisions of all the courts, and the universal voice of the people, been in favor of the obligation to return slaves to their masters under the rendition clause?' Of course they have. The decisions of the people for the last twenty years have been equally unanimous that you are a fanatic and a fool, and that the anti-slavery movement is a delusion of the devil. Does the authority of judges, legislators and clergymen have any weight with you in the latter case? I think it equally good in both cases, and not worth a farthing in either.

Equally fallacious, I think, is the reference to contemporaneous history and the constitutional debates, to enable us to decide what the Constitution really does mean. The members of the Convention voted on and passed the instrument itself, not the speeches and thoughts of the members. When the people accepted the work of the Convention, they did not accept what Mr. Gerry might have said in debate on this, Mr. Sherman on that, or Mr. Madison on the other clause; they accepted the Constitution itself.

Now, let any man of good common sense read the Constitution carefully, and he can tell whether that instrument sustains slavery or freedom, just as well as the Chief Justice of the United States. If the language is so ambiguous that it is hard to decide, or if the Convention, having the desire to sustain slavery, had not the courage to do it openly, then let every doubt be given to the side of liberty. But do not bring up contemporaneous history—what Franklin might have said in a letter to somebody, or Jefferson may have remarked on a public occasion: these matters have nothing to do with the question. I do not care, as far as the point under discussion is concerned, if it can be proved that every member of the Convention that formed the Constitution has stated in black and white that he intended the rendition clause to pass to slaves, and that he supposed Congress would refer just such a law as it has passed to enforce it. The question is not what the framers of the Constitution meant or thought, but what they did.

Now, it seems to me that we can interpret the rendition clause in favor of freedom, without doing violence to the language. The same may be said of the three-fifths representation clause. The clause that speaks of suppressing insurrection does not refer specially to slaves, but equally applies to Shay's rebellion in Massachusetts, Calhoun nullifiers of South Carolina, and all others who defy the laws and authority of the government, whether slaves or free men. As all civil government rests upon force, and would be nothing without power to enforce its laws, it follows, of course, that there must be such a clause in the Constitution, even if there were not a slave in the country.

Again—You have a great deal to say to us about the immorality of sustaining the government, (by us I mean political abolitionists,) and are constantly urging us to take what you are pleased to term a higher moral position. Now, you must not complain if we measure you by your own yardstick; while you are exhorting us to 'go up higher,' let us see if you consistently practice your own doctrine. You constantly practice against voting and holding office, as though these were the only methods by which we can participate in the government.

Now, it is impossible for a man to live in the country without helping to support the government. This he may do voluntarily or by compulsion, as he may elect. If he choose the latter course, it brings the feeble individual ludicrously into combat with the giant arm of the government. If he choose the former course, there are various methods of participation. One is by voting; another by holding office; another by paying money to support the government, by purchasing imported goods that have paid a duty, by paying the tax-gatherer, and by paying postage on letters and papers. You denounce participation by voting as immoral, yet you voluntarily furnish money in the three ways mentioned, to pay Cuba, return fugitive slaves, or for any other wicked use the government may choose. So far as I know, you do not even protest against its being used in these ways spoken of, but pay it voluntarily, at least to the post-office. Yet you denounce us with a zeal and pertinacity worthy of a better cause and more logical position, for doing just what you do yourself every day. I voted against Franklin Pierce; you did not; but you have furnished the money to enable him to perform his deeds of wickedness, and never have demurred: yet by some wonderful hocus pocus, I am a participant in the government, and must bear my share for the wickedness of its acts, while your skirts are clear, and your hands white.

Does this position commend itself to common sense? The difference between you and me in this particular is this: I am doing all I can to put good men into office, so that the laws may be executed in righteousness; you are saying, in effect—'Elect any body you please, Pierce, Buchanan, Fillmore, it is all the same to me. I will do nothing to prevent it, and when elected, I will do all you wish me to, voluntarily, towards paying the expenses.' Let right-minded and conscientious men and women judge which of the two occupies the most practical and efficient ground of opposition to slavery.

When you will refuse to wear an imported cloth, and refuse to sweeten your coffee with West India sugar, when you will refuse absolutely to pay your taxes, and let your property be sold to satisfy the law, when you will decline to use the post-office, and send your letters and papers by private hand for conscience sake, then political abolitionists will give you credit for consistency, as they now do for sincerity, devotion and conscientiousness.

Yet again—Admitting all you claim respecting the character of the Constitution, I cannot therefore admit your conclusion, that the supporting of it must always and necessarily be an immoral act. There is a great deal in the Constitution behind the clause deemed by you pro-slavery; if we can support this without giving countenance to that, we ought to do it. You think this cannot be done; I think it can. Let us see. I am appointed postmaster or revenue collector, for instance. Before entering upon the duties of my office, I am called upon to take an oath. What is the nature of the obligation? You say, doubtless, I must swear to support the whole Constitution, with all its horrible pro-slavery guarantees and obligations. It is true that I must swear to support the Constitution without qualification—what then? Does this lay upon me the obligation to perform all the duties ever required of any body and every body by that instrument? To ask this question is to answer it. If this were so, every man that ever took an oath to support the Constitution is a perjurer; for no man can do every thing in one office that is required of all the officers, from Postmaster to President. The oath, in my estimation, amounts to just

this, and no more: in taking it, I promise to perform the duties of my office in a constitutional manner; and this is the whole of it. Any other interpretation than this is absurd. If I am postmaster, I agree to charge the established rates, to go through the necessary forms, to make faithful returns, &c. &c. So of any other office. Hence the Constitution may be steeped to the very lips in pro-slavery guarantees, yet I should be fully justified in swearing to support it, unless the nature and duties of my office required special action in favor of slavery. Under this view, I could without guilt take almost any office in the country. I could be a member of Congress, and swear to do my duty in a constitutional manner as such. I should be my own judge of what is and what is not constitutional, and could therefore always act for liberty without violating my oath: yes more, I could be President, and in a case should occur (which is not likely) that slavery must be protected by force of arms or the Constitution violated, then I could resign, as suggested by Mr. Whipple in a recent article in THE LIBERATOR.

The bugbear that an oath to support the Constitution commits the individual taking it irreversibly to every article, clause, line and syllable therein contained is the simplest sophistry ever believed by honest and confiding souls.

Now to review very briefly:

First—I maintain that the Constitution, interpreted by English grammars and dictionaries, is an anti-slavery instrument.

Second—If we are immoral in giving voluntary support to the government by voting, you are equally so by giving voluntary support thereto in money.

Third—Admitting for argument's sake your premises respecting the Constitution, I utterly deny your conclusions, and maintain that voting is a high anti-slavery duty, which no man is justified in neglecting.

Let your readers and the public judge which is right in this matter.

Very truly, yours,

J. T. C.

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY.

To the Editor of the Liberator:

I desire to make a few remarks on an article in the Boston Journal of the 15th inst., which ought to open the eyes of all genuine abolitionists who felt disposed for the first or second time to forego their non-voting principles, and vote for the Republican candidates at the coming election. The Journal, after stating that the South is ignorant of the true state of feeling at the North, proposes that a document be prepared, setting forth 'what the North demands as a right, and what is the true meaning of the great Northern movement now in progress,' and 'circulated broadcast through the South and West.' The document to embrace four points:—

1st. Freedom for Kansas, and a settlement of this exciting question.

This is very well, but the abolitionists have a more excellent way, which embraces not only freedom for Kansas, but for the whole nation; not only for white, but for black.

2d. An admission of the principle, 'No more slavery extension,' at any rate, north of the Missouri compromise line.

Mark the words we have put in italics—'No more slavery extension.' At any rate, north of the Missouri compromise line! And this is the great Republican party, with its loud professions of anti-slavery principle, its cry of 'no more slavery extension,' without limitation, going to fall back to such a petty issue as this? Are abolitionists going to accept such a paltry concession as this to their radical claims? Are we going back ten years on our career? Are we going to give up our assault upon the stronghold of the enemy, fall back upon a second line of defence, and then ground arms? Do we regret that the Missouri Compromise has been abandoned, and desire nothing more than its restoration? No! we rejoice at it. The ultimate advantage of that act is on our side. We cannot, if we understand the philosophy of the anti-slavery movement, consent to any such step.

3d. An entire disconnection of the entire government with the question of slavery, any further than may be necessary under the Constitution.

4th. An understanding that the agitation of this subject on the floor of Congress shall cease.

'Hail you there, Old Truancy!' Is new Republicanism nothing but old Whiggery? Is the same face to be acted over again, with the same old shroud of the Union and the Constitution, the same drowsy tune, 'no agitation,' 'discussion must be suppressed,' with a new set of actors, and the old scenery untouched? Are we to take 'another round or two for fun' in the same old treadmill? It will not do. The devil may dress like a gentleman, but the cloven hoof and caudal appendage will remain to identify him, and no rose water can efface the odor of the habitation he has left. O! how long shall the people be deceived? Is it all we have learned from the outrages of the last six years? Laws passed whose infamy words cannot describe, a solemn compact violated, a wide territory opened to slavery, the whole power and influence of the government exerted to force slavery into it contrary to the wishes of a great majority of its settlers, peaceful and industrious men driven to take refuge on foreign soil or carried back to slavery, court-houses in chains, judges sitting under the protection of hired bayonets and prajuding the case before them, women imprisoned for teaching little children to read, mothers killing their children to save them from a living death, tyrannical judges stretching arbitrary power, the country plunged into civil war, women violated and men scalped with more than Indian cruelty, barbarism and ruffianism triumphant at Kansas and Washington, a President of the United States advising the people not to concern themselves about their institutions, the very foundations of liberty overthrown and destroyed, and all we are asked to do is to resist the extension of slavery, 'at any rate, north of the Missouri compromise line,' to remain faithful to the Constitution, and to stop agitation! What is it to 'disconnect the government from slavery any further than may be necessary under the Constitution'? Is it not to allow slavery to remain a basis of representation, to agree to the surrender of fugitive slaves, to pledge the whole power of the government to sustain the 'peculiar institution'? What is it to stop agitation? Is it not to fiddle while Rome is burning? Is it not to sacrifice our dearest rights, to neglect our most sacred duty? Is it not to slumber while the Slave Power is preparing a new plot to spring upon us, more hideous than those which have preceded it? Is it not to say to the slave, 'We will do no more for you? to give the guilty conscience of the nation a little more sleep and a little more lumber? So long as there is electricity shall there be thunder and lightning; so long as a spark lights upon gunpowder shall there be an explosion; so long as freedom and slavery exist together in these States shall there be agitation and turmoil, the sea and waves roaring. The wolf cannot yet lie down with the lamb. The Republican party is very willing to agitate just enough to get itself into power, but that end gained, all agitation must cease. It would injure the party. We must wait and see what can be done. The Senate is against us. Then must we listen to the dictates of a heartless policy. Then we shall have new compromises and new sacrifices, and the race of doughfaces shall be perpetuated, and the Union shall be saved and the people betrayed, and liberty perish, and the slave be laden with shackles ten fold heavier than before.

Abolitionists do not intend that agitation shall cease; they do desire a dissolution of the Union; they do 'countenance interference with slavery as it exists.' They will be satisfied with nothing less. They do not desire to defer the crisis which must come sooner or later, and the sooner the better. The Republican party will do nothing to further our ends. Let us not join hands with it. Let it alone, and time will justify our course.

Y. Y.

Boston, Sept. 20, 1856.

ANDREW JACKSON DAVIS.

LIVONIA, (Mich.) Sept. 14, 1856.

EDITOR LIBERATOR:

I noticed with regret an article in THE LIBERATOR of Aug. 26th, from the pen of James Barnaby, directly and unsparingly assailing the honesty of A. J. Davis—a man who, by the expression of the most radical and uncompromising views concerning Government, social, political and ecclesiastical, ideas in theology unparalleled in original and inherent beauty, facts in science undreamed of by the savants and schoolmen of either continent, has earned for himself the title of Reformer and Man of Science.

Your correspondent commences his disquisition by the assumption that yourself and other intelligent reformers exercise much less than your usual discrimination when treating of matters pertaining to spiritual intercourse, citing as proof thereof your notice of Davis's Penetrals, &c. He then proceeds to assert that the popularity of A. J. Davis's works is attributable more to the fact of their claim to a 'superior origin,' than to any intrinsic merit of their own. Next we find the following harmonious sentence in immediate juxtaposition:—

'I am well aware that several persons of respectable scientific and literary attainments have spoken of Mr. Davis's works in terms of unqualified praise. * * * The scientific importance claimed for Mr. Davis's works has been admitted by but few persons of high literary attainments.'

He next says that the amount of scientific knowledge displayed in Mr. Davis's works is far too great to be expected from one who has never read at all on scientific subjects, and that a young man of acute and vigorous intellect, a taste for reading and a good memory, with access to such works as Dr. Lardner's and Professor Nicol's Lectures, the Vestiges of Creation, &c., might in a few years, by devoting a small portion of his time to reading, acquire the amount of scientific knowledge requisite to the production of such works as Mr. Davis's.

This last proposition we are not prepared to dispute; but does it necessarily follow that Mr. Davis's scientific knowledge was acquired in that manner? The passage certainly means this, if it has any meaning, thus charging Mr. Davis with the grossest imposture and deception, alleging no reason save that such might very possibly be the case! Rather a flimsy pretext for so grave a charge.

He next denies all intention to undermine Mr. Davis's works, and then proceeds to say (we suppose as proof of his excellent intentions) that the works are far inferior to the 'Vestiges of Creation,' which itself contains many inaccuracies; that they contain many assertions which have neither the merit of novelty, originality, nor truth; that his blundering and theorizing unfit his works for any save such as are familiar with the sciences on which they treat; that he adopts many old errors and discovers no new truth; and finally clinches his argument against the honesty of Mr. Davis by the following *exposition*:—

'The things to be established are opposed to the conclusions, reason, judgment and experience of *myself* and of mankind generally. Hence the testimony which sustains them must be stronger than their own inherent impossibility.'

This mode of argument strikes me as about as logical as that of the Irishman, who, when arraigned for stealing a coat, and direct evidence having been produced to the fact, indignantly exclaimed, 'And shure, yer honor would not convict me on the evidence of that spalpeen who says he saw me stole the coat, when I can bring a hundred gentlemen who will swear they didn't see me stole it.'

Fault-finding is easy, particularly with a man who never replies, through the medium of the public press, to any of his assailants. Will your Salem correspondent be kind enough to show wherein consist some of Mr. Davis's 'blundering' and falsehoods, 'having neither the merit of originality nor novelty.'

In search of truth,

Yours, R. L. ALEXANDER.

JAMES BARNABY AND A. J. DAVIS.

SALEM, (Ohio), Sept. 15, 1856.

VALUED FRIEND W. L. G.:

In a late number of THE LIBERATOR is an article over the signature of James Barnaby, regarding which, and the writer, permit a few remarks.

I am well acquainted with your correspondent, and know him to be posted in the philosophies which have excited the admiration of Andrew J. Davis's readers, who, not being general readers, are ignorant of the fact that similar philosophies are to be found elsewhere. Now, the important question in this discussion is, Did A. J. Davis obtain his ideas, directly or indirectly, from what was written by Lardner, Nicol and others, or were they impressed by influx? True it is, the same philosophy may be found in books written before Davis wrote, but did he derive his theory from them? Who can tell? What are the probabilities in the case? If the statements respecting his early education, his subsequent habits and mode of life may be relied on, and he has acquired his information in the usual way, he must be a prodigy among students. Does his phenology indicate it? Two years ago, he said he had not then read a scientific work. His opponents who hear this must question his veracity or their own conclusions.

It is discreet to guard against humbuggery, but it is well to know that we are liable to the opposite extreme. Our predilections may be effectually disquieted as for the perception of truth on the one hand, as the detection of error on the other. We have each our measure or test, by which we try all things. In the first place, it is requisite that these measures, these tests, be accurate; and secondly, that we use them with care and skill. Who but the Spiritualist can have the test by which to try Spiritualism? The blind cannot see colors, nor the deaf hear sounds. This, however, does not deprive the existence of color and sound. Very few persons are exempt from over-tenacity of opinion. This is not less true of thinkers than of those who adopt the opinions of others upon trust. It is only when the former have unquestionable data that they possess advantages over the latter.

Where are the data to prove the truth of Spiritualism? No where, unless Spiritualists have them.—Where are the data to prove the doctrine false? Will it be answered, Much that purports to be revelation is false, more or less, and still more ridiculous? The theory accounts for this, by assuming that spirits continue to be themselves, subject, as here, to the law of progression. If impostures have been practised on and by mediums, so be it, say the advocates; impostures are not peculiar to this department. There is bogus oil, but there are genuine silver dollars, nevertheless. It is said that the manifestations cannot be accounted for by known laws, and should therefore be rejected. It is asked, Are they contrary to known laws? Who can say that known laws cannot produce phenomena which have not been observed? Who knows that there are not undiscovered laws? And who does not know that known laws conflict?

It may be that J. B. is right when he says that what is true is not new; the other part of the sentence, on reflection, he may think proper to modify.

If there be men who assume to know all the laws and the conditions in the universe, J. B. will not be one of them; yet it is possible that he might unwarily and unconsciously occupy a tantamount position.

The writer of this is not a Spiritualist, technically. The theory appears to him beautiful, and quite reasonable, on the predilection of man's immortality; but he does not know that it is true. He has witnessed physical and other manifestations for which he knows of no adequate cause. He feels assured there was no imposture, and to admit that it was illusion, is to consent that he is always dreaming—unless every thing that is illusion which cannot be accounted for by some known operation of some known law. All has failed, however, to make him a believer. The facts he knows, of the philosophy or agency, truth requires him to acknowledge his ignorance. There is nothing peculiar in this ignorance.

ance. Growth and reproduction in the animal and vegetable kingdoms are facts; some of the essential conditions are known, but of the energy, force or vitality which is in operation during the processes, who takes cognizance? Who can tell its mode of existence or manner of operation?

Knowledge is useful, rationales desirable; but if they cannot be attained by present development, better not ignore the facts. If we deny or repudiate all phenomena that come not within the limits of our comprehension, we shall be in danger of finding ourselves alone in space, if we do not soon doubt that we are ourselves in it.

AMOS GILBERT.

P. S. Meetings of all kinds, and horse races, over for the present. The last meeting of the Friends of Progress was better than last year, I think; I should be happy to know that thus much might be said at each successive assembling. All cannot be gratified until we are more of one mind. I should have preferred to have had a session, at least, occupied in discussing Education, but the meeting decided that ten minutes would suffice. Did they believe, as I do, that it underlies all reform, they would have decided differently. They labor to cure evil, I to prevent it. We may see eye to eye by and by. I hope no one will understand me to mean by the off-mouthed word education, less than that course of training which develops the moral and social nature so as to draw out (not drive in) the best specimens of humanity, if possible, a generation of full grown, true men and women.